



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

#### IV.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE INFINITIVE UPON VERBS SUBORDINATED TO IT.

The standard Latin grammars usually recognize the fact that an infinitive may have the power of shifting the mood of a verb that depends upon it. Now, the lists of examples given to illustrate the usage, as one finds them in Holtze,<sup>1</sup> Kühner,<sup>2</sup> Roby, etc., contain many citations that are not to the point, as, for instance, examples of indirect discourse, attraction by the subjunctive, descriptive relative clauses, and other irrelevant matter. The habits and limitations of the construction have not been clearly understood, or, to say the least, have not been explained. The reasons that have been offered as explanation of the possession of this somewhat arbitrary power on the part of the infinitive are hardly adequate. Evidently a more careful study of the question is called for. I propose in this paper, in fulfilment of a promise made when discussing<sup>3</sup> the construction of attraction by the subjunctive, to explain the connection between this and the allied constructions of indirect discourse and of attraction proper, both in origin and in usage, and to define the scope of its influence. For this purpose I have listed all the verbs, whether indicative or subjunctive, that depend upon infinitives in early Latin to the time of Lucretius, not inclusive, and also in representative portions of classical and later Latin.

Let us first see what verbs exert this influence upon a dependent verb. The *historical* or *descriptive infinitive* seems to lack

<sup>1</sup> Syntaxis, II, p. 191 ff. His list, which, by the way, does not distinguish this construction from that of indirect discourse and of attraction proper, includes, for example, instances of the second person singular indefinite subjunctive: Cist. I, 1, 25; Merc. III, 2, 7 (552), and of the anticipatory subjunctive: Aul. 12; Epid. II, 2, 94 (277). The list is wholly untrustworthy.

<sup>2</sup> Grammatik, II, p. 789. His rule, which may be taken as a representative one, reads: Daher steht der Konjunktiv in allen Nebensätzen, welche in einem genauen und inneren Zusammenhange mit einem durch den Konjunktiv oder durch den *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* oder durch den *blossen Infinitiv* ausgedrückten Gedanken stehen. Roby's lists consist mainly of examples of oratio obliqua (1772-6).

<sup>3</sup> Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, Chicago, 1904.

the power. We shall discuss the reason later. Early Latin<sup>1</sup> furnishes but few instances of verbs in dependence upon infinitives of this kind. The examples are in Eun. 432, Andr. 63, Andr. 96, Lucilius Inc. 22 (M), all of which are in the indicative. Cicero<sup>2</sup> gives six instances, Caesar<sup>3</sup> two, Sallust<sup>4</sup> forty-three, Vergil<sup>5</sup> four. These are likewise in the indicative, as are those of Livy,<sup>6</sup> Curtius,<sup>7</sup> Tacitus,<sup>8</sup> Justinus,<sup>9</sup> unless inherently subjunctive. There are no verbs in dependence upon the few instances in Horace,<sup>10</sup> Ovid<sup>11</sup> and Nepos.<sup>12</sup> Outside of the authors mentioned, there are not very many occurrences of the historical infinitive in Latin, and, I think, no instances to disprove the conclusions here reached.

The *exclamatory infinitive* occurs some sixty times in early Latin<sup>13</sup> but is not often accompanied by a dependent clause. In the following six examples where it does, the indicative is found : Asin. 226, Cas. 89, Andr. 245, Phorm. 340, Adel. 630, Naevius 71 (R). In Cicero the exclamatory infinitive is frequently found, but its dependent verbs are in the indicative except where they are in the subjunctive mood for inherent reasons. I find no

<sup>1</sup> The references to the occurrences of the historical infinitive in early Latin poets may be found in Golenski, *De Infin. apud Poetas Lat. Usu* (1863), p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> I have used the references of Mohr, *De Infin. Hist.* (1878), p. 29, and Müller, *Lehre vom Infin.* (1878), p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Mohr (ad loc. cit.). Indirect discourse is implied in B. G. 1, 16, 1; though Heynacker, *Sprachgebrauch Caesars*, p. 114, believes the subjunctive due to the presence of the historical infinitive. The relative clause of B. G. 5, 33, 1 is causal.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Huebenthal, *Quaestiones de usu. inf. hist. apud Sall. et Tac.* (1881). Indirect discourse is implied in Jug. 70, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Krause, *De Verg. usu. Infin.* (1878), p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> Kühnast, *Liv. Syntax*, p. 245.

<sup>7</sup> Eger, *De Infin. Curtiano*, 1885.

<sup>8</sup> Huebenthal, ad loc. cit.

<sup>9</sup> Wentzel, *De Infin. apud Iustinum usu* (1893), p. 68.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Indebetou, *De usu infin. Horatiano, Upsaliae*, p. 37, for the references.

<sup>11</sup> Trillhaas, *Der Inf. bei Ovid*, p. 22.

<sup>12</sup> Eidenschink, *Der Inf. bei Nepos*, p. 29.

<sup>13</sup> Reinkens, *Ueber den acc. cum inf. bei Plautus und Ter.* (1887), though untrustworthy, will give most of the examples. See also Lübker, *De usu Inf. Plaut.*, p. 28; and Kraz, *Stuttgarter Progr.* (1862), p. 35. In Phorm. 502, *Atque Antipho alia quom occupatus esset sollicitudine tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum*, the dependent verb may be an early instance of a subjunctive with *quom*, or it may have so much of the feeling of remonstrance which appears in the infinitive as to call for the subjunctive of exclamation.

dependent clauses attached to this infinitive in Livy,<sup>1</sup> Caesar, Sallust, Tacitus, Nepos, Vergil, Horace and Ovid. Outside of the above-mentioned authors this infinitive is practically a negligible quantity. It seems then that the grammars should omit the exclamatory infinitive also from the aforementioned rule.

Of course, the *verba sentiendi et declarandi* do not come under consideration in this treatment. There are, however, several verbs not strictly belonging to that list which are very prone to cast an implication of oratio obliqua over the clauses depending upon their infinitives. These are verbs like *iubeo*, *decerno*, *constituo*, *postulo*, *veto*, after which a command or prohibition is practically quoted, and verbs and phrases of feeling, like *miror laetor*, *gaudeo*, *molestè fero*, etc. There would be little point in saying that the mood of *possit* in M. G. 182, *iube transire huc quantum possit*, is due to the presence of the infinitive. The dependent clause is obviously a part of the quoted command and is in the subjunctive of indirect discourse. It is sometimes said that attraction and oratio obliqua are both at work in such examples. The statement may be true for early Latin, but there seems good evidence for the belief that Cicero is consistent in using the subjunctive only when the feeling of oratio obliqua is definitely present; that when this force is absent he is careful to indicate the fact by using the indicative; and that the presence of the infinitive *per se* makes no difference. There would be every reason to expect such a distinction. Since verbs like *iubeo*, etc., so frequently associate with the subjunctive of oratio obliqua, misunderstanding would at once be caused if the subjunctives were employed for purely formal reasons. But there is even more definite evidence for believing that such a distinction was felt. With the use of Merguet's lexicon I have found thirty-three instances of the subjunctive<sup>2</sup> and fourteen of the indicative<sup>3</sup> in clauses closely attached to infinitives with *iubeo* in the speeches and philosophical works of Cicero. So far as I can determine

<sup>1</sup> This negative statement is based upon the collection of examples of the infinitive given in the special treatises mentioned above.

<sup>2</sup> Rab. 20; Rab. Post. 8; Phil. I, 23; Cæcin. 54, 60, 102; Verr. II, 138; V, 103; Tull. 47; Clu. 148; leg. agr. I, 6 bis; I, 10; I, 12; I, 13; II, 16; II, 20; II, 26; II, 38; II, 50; II, 63; II, 73; Mur. 51; Sen. 27; har. resp. 11; Fin. II, 1; Tusc. I, 7; IV, 51; Nat. II, 7; Leg. II, 39; II, 60; Off. III, 66.

<sup>3</sup> Quinct. 25; Verr. II, 42; II, 63; V, 85; Clu. 14; Cat. III, 10; III, 12; Arch. 25; dom. 54; Phil. V, 22; Fin. II, 69; II, 97; Div. I, 54.

from these instances, the subjunctive is never used merely because of the presence of the infinitive; and whenever, as often happens, the necessity of indicating *oratio obliqua* by the mood is obviated by the use of an explicit word like *dicere* and *cognoscere*, the verb is invariably in the indicative. Cf. Cat. III, 10, *tabellas proferri iussimus quae a quoque dicebantur datae* (= *quae a quoque datae essent*); also Cat. III, 12; Phil. V, 22; Plaut. Trin. 955; Caes. B. G. 4, 22, 6. If the bare presence of the infinitive were enough to call for a subjunctive, it would sometimes be found in such sentences where implied indirect discourse is out of the question.<sup>1</sup> For this reason I should treat the subjunctive after infinitives that depend upon verbs of command or prohibition as examples of implied indirect discourse and not as due to the influence of the infinitive.

It is worthy of note that in Cicero the proportion of subjunctives to indicatives in the cases just treated was 33: 14, a proportion almost as high as that which holds in *oratio obliqua* in Cicero, and far too high for attraction by the infinitive, as will appear later. The following lists will give the examples with *iubeo* in Plautus and Terence:

*iubeo* + infinitive + subjunctive.

M. G. 182; 981; Pseud. 1150; Andr. 464.

*iubeo* + infinitive + indicative.

Curc. 425, Men. 869, M. G. 315; 974; 981; 1314; Rud. 332; 856; Trin. 955; Eun. 470; 836; Adel. 908. Inc. Fab. Rib. I, 51.

Further illustrations from Classical Latin of the preceding statement will be found in the following lists: *Decerno* is followed by an infinitive and subjunctive of *oratio obliqua* in Cic. sen. 27; har. resp. 15; Milo, 14; Phil. V, 53; Fin. IV, 59; *veto* is followed by the same construction in Tusc. III, 11; Rep. I, 27; Leg. II, 67. So also *constituo* in B. G. I, 16, 1; Cic. Fin. III, 39; Off. II, 9; Fin. III, 50. The indicative is very rare after these verbs. It may be worth noting that after such verbs, the dependent clause is at times the integral part of a quoted statement of fact, at times the part of a quoted command or resolve.

As stated in the preceding, *verbs of feeling* also usually involve a subjunctive of *oratio obliqua*. Cf. Cluent. 141, *molestē fortasse*

<sup>1</sup> Such examples could reasonably be expected, for in ordinary instances of implied indirect discourse, the subjunctive occurs freely with *dicere* and the like. Cf. Phil. II, 7, *litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit*. Cf. Verr. V, 17. They also occur frequently in *quod* causal clauses: Kühner, p. 790.

*tulerat* se in eis orationibus *reprehensum* quas de re publica *habuisset*. Flacc. 19, *mirandum* uero est homines eos . . . libenter *arripere* facultatem laedendi quaecumque *detur*. Planc. 46, noli *mirari* te id quod tua dignitas *postularit* . . non *esse adsecutum*. These must obviously be classed as illustrating indirect discourse, not the influence of the infinitive.

We now come to the mass of commonly occurring infinitives. In the following treatment I shall classify them merely with reference to their connection with the construction under discussion. I shall *first* treat of those that can, roughly speaking, be displaced by subjunctives, likewise those that may, like infinitives in indirect discourse, have an accusative subject, and *secondly* of the complementary infinitives that do not come under the first class. Under the *first* group fall most of the infinitives after verbs of *will* (*volo, nolo, malo, studeo*, etc.), *wish* (*cupio, opto, desidero*, etc.), *permission* (*sino, permitto, patior, licet, libet*, etc.), *obligation and propriety* (*oportet, aequum est, decet, dedecet, necesse est*, etc.) and other verbs and phrases similar to these. In the *second* group belong many verbs of attitude that are followed by a complementary infinitive. These verbs are *debeo, possum, queo, coepi, incipio, propero, cesso, audeo* and the like.

Obviously attraction will occur far more frequently in connection with verbs of the first group than with those of the second. In the first place, the infinitive is here practically equivalent to a subjunctive, which would be prone to attract its subordinate clause into the subjunctive. Sentences like Phorm. 449, *quae in rem tuam sint uelim facias*, would of course suggest such as Capt. 363, *nolt* te nouos erus operam dare tuo ueteri domino *quod* is *uelit*. In the second place, such sentences often have the subject of the infinitive in the accusative, which gives them a formal resemblance to the construction of oratio obliqua. This resemblance would naturally lead to a similarity of construction. If then an infinitive of this kind with an accusative subject acquires the power of attracting its dependent verb, it might be expected to continue exerting that power even when it stood as a mere complementary infinitive without subject accusative<sup>1</sup>, as in Aul. 751, *facere quod lubeat licet*.

<sup>1</sup> It must also be borne in mind that the subjunctive of oratio obliqua is not confined to verbs that depend upon infinitives with accusative subjects. There are not a few instances like the following in which, after a personal passive verb, the subject of the infinitive is in the nominative: Res Pub. II, 4, is igitur, *ut natus sit, dicitur* ab Amulio . . . exponi *iussus esse*.

By analogy, the verbs and phrases of similar meaning, though they never or seldom govern subjunctives, acquire for their infinitives the same power of "attraction" as the above-mentioned. Thus *deceat*, which seldom governs a subjunctive, is treated like *oportet*, which often does. Cf. Pseud. 460, *deceat innocentem qui sit . . . seruum superbum esse*. Expressions like *honestum est*, *par est*, *utile est*, *iniurium est*, are not unlike *aequomst*, whose infinitive often "attracts". They too acquire the habit. Cf. Hec. 73, *iniuriumst qua uia te captent eadem ipsos capi*.

Even in this group one must guard against accepting examples of oratio obliqua. Thus Cicero is particularly fond of using *velle* in the sense of *he will have it that*, in which case the subordinate verb falls into the category of indirect discourse. Cf. Tusc. I, 79, *uolt quicquid natum sit interire*.

The clauses occurring in early Latin that are closely attached to infinitives of the first group are found in the following list. When the infinitive itself depends upon a subjunctive, I have not listed the dependent verb here, since in such cases, attraction by the subjunctive is involved. The indicatives and the subjunctives are placed in parallel columns for the sake of comparison. Space does not permit anything but a mere enumeration of the indicative examples.

INDICATIVE.	SUBJUNCTIVE.
<i>uolo</i> : Amph. 7, 980; Asin. 232, Cist. 718, Merc. 273, 490, 1010; M. G. 183; 1245; Most. 758; Pers. 511, 578, 592, 681, 826; Poen. 491, 727; Pseud. 605, 751; Rud. 464, 1074; Trin. 488, Andr. 195, Heaut. 107, Phorm. 657, Hec. 725, Adel. 186, Inc. Fab. <sup>3</sup> R. I., 161.	Bacch. <sup>1</sup> 58, <i>apud me te esse . . . miles quom ueniat uolo</i> . Bacch. <sup>1</sup> 76, <i>miles quom huc adueniat te uolo me amplexari</i> . Stich. <sup>1</sup> 686, <i>quisquis<sup>2</sup> praetereat commissatum uolo uocari</i> . Capt. <sup>1</sup> 363, <i>uolt te nouos erus operam dare quod is uelit</i> .

<sup>1</sup> The dependent clause refers to the future. Perhaps the proper interpretation would consider these as instances of the anticipatory subjunctive. Cf. Hale, The Anticipatory Subjunctive, p. 65. Lange, De Sententiarum Temporalium usu, p. 40, has given a list of examples like these, and attributes their mood to the fact that they point to the future. He is partly right, but he overworks his theory in explaining doubtful cases. So, for instance, when, on p. 46, he places in the same category examples like Capt. 146, *alienus quom eius incommodum tam aegre feras, quid me par facerest*, where there is no hint of futurity, he has carried his theory too far.

<sup>2</sup> Ritschl amended to *qui*. For the use of the indefinite pronoun see Prehn, Quaestiones Plautinae de pron. indef. (Strassburg, 1887), who, however, does not notice the presence of the infinitive in this case, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Scaenicae Rom. Poesis Frag., Ribbeck, vol. I-II.

## INDICATIVE.

*nolo*: Poen. 458, Stich. 142.  
*malo*: Hec. 111, Men. 721.  
*studeo*: Asin. 381.  
*cupio*: Epid. 270, Trin. 54, Heaut. 497.  
*expeto*: Enn. (R. I) 779.  
*sino*: Most. 12, Eun. 124, Pacuuius  
 (R. I) 325.  
*patior*: Bacch. 464, Most. 175, Stich.  
 125.  
*licet*: Amph. 452, Cas. 794, Merc.  
 152, M. G. 1329, Heaut. 666,  
 Hec. 12, Adel. 179, Afranius  
 (R. II) 119.  
*lubet*: Bacch. 932, Men. 397.  
*oportet*: Asin. 382, Bacch. 602, Capt.  
 955, Epid. 262, Men. 971, Most.  
 220, 801; Pers. 7, Poen. 627,  
 1074; Rud. 1385, Stich. 106,  
 726; Truc. 76, Cato R. R. 2,  
 3, 17, 20, 35, 38, 54, 64, 133,  
 134, 151, 155; Enn. (R. I) 320;  
 Titinius (R. II) 98.  
*aequomst*: Bacch. 525, Cas. 265, Poen.  
 1081, Phorm. 451.

## SUBJUNCTIVE.

Aul. 751, *facere quod lubeat*<sup>1</sup> licet.  
 Cas. 873, *audacius licet quae uelis*<sup>1</sup>  
 libere proloqui.  
 Cas. 570, qui aduocatos *aduocet*  
 rogitare oportet.  
 Pers. 273, emere oportet quem tibi  
 oboedire *uelis*.  
 Pseud. 439, probum patrem esse  
 oportet qui . . . *postulet*.  
 Stich. 69,<sup>2</sup> pati nos oportet quod  
 ille *faciat*.  
 Truc. 225, oportet<sup>1</sup> . . . ut quisque  
*ueniat* blande . . . adloqui.  
 Aul. 130, ita aequomst quod in rem  
 esse . . . *arbitremur* . . .  
 monere.  
 Rud. 321, cum istius modi uirtuti-  
 bus . . . natus qui *sit*  
 eumquidem ad carni-  
 ficemst aequius . . .  
 commeare.  
 Trin. 176, utrum indicare . . .  
 aequom fuit aduersum  
 quam *obsecrauisset*.

<sup>1</sup> Conditional relative clauses, especially with *uelle*, *nolle*, and the like, are prone to take on a feeling of "softened statement" or "less vivid futurity," even in dependence upon indicatives. Cf. Pers. 489, nunquam posthac tibi *quod nolis* uolam; Stich. 362, res omnes relictas habeo prae quod *tu uelis*. Such sentences are rare, but there are enough to call for a warning against attributing any subjunctive in a generalizing clause with complete confidence to the influence of the infinitive. These remarks apply to several of the examples which follow.

<sup>2</sup> Rodenbusch, De Temporum usu Plautino, p. 64, and Blase, Hist. Gram. p. 124, find the subjunctive of futurity in this example. The next one (Truc. 225) is probably of the same nature: cf. Lange, loc. cit., p. 40.



INDICATIVE.

*deceat*: Amph. 522, Pers. 113, Rud. 920,  
Turpilius (R. II) 127; Titinius  
(R. II) 158.

*opus est*: Stich. 232.

*necesse est*: Asin. 218, Cist. 46, Stich.  
219, Hec. 305.

Miscellaneous:

*conducibilest*, Cist. 79;  
*rectiust*, Pers. 345;  
*satiust*, Adel. 30;  
*difficilest*, Trin. 620;  
*stultitiast*, Cas. 282; Pers. 799;  
*expedit*, Cato R. R. 9;

SUBJUNCTIVE.

Phorm. 202, *istaec quom ita sint* tanto  
magis te aduigilare  
aequomst.<sup>1</sup>

Phorm. 929, non est aequom me prop-  
ter uos decipi quom ego  
uostri honoris causa re-  
pudium alterae *re-*  
*miserim*.<sup>1</sup>

Hec. 840,<sup>2</sup> ex quo *fuertint* com-  
moda, eius incommoda  
aequomst ferre.

Men. 204, hoc animo deceat ani-  
matus esse amatores  
probos qui quidem ad  
mendacitatem *properent*.

Rud. 113, peculiosum esse addeceat  
seruom quem ero prae-  
sente *praetereat* oratio aut  
qui inclementer *dicat*  
homini libero.

Pseud. 460, *deceat* innocentem qui  
*sit* . . . seruom superbum  
esse.

*par est*, Capt. 146,<sup>3</sup> alienus quom eius  
incommodum tam aegre *feras*  
. . . quid me par facere est?  
*honestumst*, Hec. 148,<sup>4</sup> quam *decererim*  
. . . . eam ludibrio haberi  
neque honestum est.

<sup>1</sup>I include these as possible instances, though I feel that a causal or adversative clause can rarely be conceived of as an integral part of the main sentence. Some other explanation for the mood should if possible be found. These examples may be early instances of the subjunctive with *quom*, or unconscious uses of the subjunctive by a scribe who is following the usage of his day. The second one shows a strong tone of remonstrance. Cf. pp. 7-9 of my paper on Attraction of Mood in Early Latin. I fail to see in either of them any such reference to future time as Lange, loc. cit., p. 46, finds.

<sup>2</sup>*Attigerit* of Truc. 226 is classed here by Holtze, Syntax, p. 193. It is probably not in the subjunctive but in the future perfect indicative.

<sup>3</sup>See note on Phorm. 202 above.

<sup>4</sup>The mood may be due to the causal force.

## INDICATIVE.

## Miscellaneous:

*officiūmst*, Truc. 436;  
*facinus est*, Aul. 587;  
*virtus est*, Pers. 268;  
*pudicitia**st*, Stich. 100;  
*facilest*, Turpilius (R. II) 9.

*As subject or predicate of est*, Adel. 132, Poen.  
 572, Lucilius 119 (B. VI).

*pudet*, Afranius (R. II) 272.

## SUBJUNCTIVE.

*utilest*, Adel. 341, quom *amet* alium  
 non est utile hanc illi dari.

*stultitiast*, Cas. 565, stultitia magnast  
 . . . amatorem ad forum pro-  
 cedere in eum diem quo quod  
*amet* in mundo siet.

*flagitiumst*, Poen. 966, flagitiumst tuas  
 tu popularis pati seruire ante  
 oculos domi quae *fuertint*<sup>1</sup>  
 liberae.

*iniuriumst*, Hec. 73, iniuriumst qua via  
 te *captent* eadem ipsos capi.

*inscitiast*,<sup>2</sup> Accius (R. I) 215, id quod  
 multi *inuideant* multique *ex-*  
*petant* inscitiast postulare.

The following examples taken from among representative verbs in Cicero will show the relative prevalence of the construction in his writings, for, though I have not covered the whole ground, my lists of the indicative are as complete as those of the subjunctive, and comparisons are safe. The infinitive after *uolo* takes the subjunctive in Phil. VIII, 26, cauere etiam uult iis qui secum *sint*; Piso, 99, circumspectantem omnia, quicquid *increpuiisset* . . . omnis uidere te uolui; Verr.<sup>3</sup> III, 164, nihil cuiquam probari uolo me dicente quod non ante mihimet ipsi *probatum sit*; Fin.<sup>4</sup> V, 52, cum uolumus nomina eorum qui id *gesserint* nota nobis esse. Of indicatives after this infinitive there are thirty-four instances in the philosophical works and orations of

<sup>1</sup> The mood may be due to causal force.

<sup>2</sup> This example I offer with much diffidence. It is not unlikely that the descriptive subjunctive had developed far enough to enter clauses of this kind by the time of Accius.

<sup>3</sup> Though the mood of the generalizing clause even after a negative is regularly the indicative, yet there are often instances of the subjunctive after negatives. This fact prevents us from offering the above quoted example with complete confidence as due to the presence of the infinitive, cf. Hale, Cum-Constructions, p. 133.

<sup>4</sup> Classifying clauses like this one occasionally, though relatively rarely, take the subjunctive, for reasons explained in Hale, Cum-Constructions, p. 120. The following, in which *uelle*=*censere*, should be taken as illustrating oratio obliqua: Fin. I, 79; V, 41; III, 50; Nat. II, 64; Div. II, 93; Tim. 37. Even with this meaning the indicative occurs: cf. Fin. IV, 39; Nat. III, 54.

Cicero (of which the following are typical: Acad. II, 19; Tusc. IV, 61; Sulla 31, leg. agr. II, 20; Sest. 110).

With *oportet* the influence of the infinitive is illustrated by Fin. I, 47, stare oportet in eo quod *sit iudicatum*; Nat. II, 41<sup>1</sup>, solem animantem esse oportet et quidem reliqua astra quae *oriantur* in ardore; Nat. III<sup>2</sup>, 21, oportet . . . non te ipsum quod *uelis* sumere; Caec. Div.<sup>3</sup> 58, de iniuria quae tibi *facta sit*, indicem esse oportet quam te ipsum. There are twelve instances of the indicative in the same amount of Cicero.

With *necesse est*, the following from the philosophical works and orations show the influence of the infinitive: Tusc. III, 15, necesse est qui *fortis sit* eundem esse magni animi; Tusc. III, 18, qui *sit frugi* . . . eum necesse est esse constantem (cf. III, 14, qui *fortis est*, idem est fidens); also Nat. II, 29; Div. II, 71; Off. I, 153; Off. III, 35; Fin.<sup>4</sup> I, 40; Tusc.<sup>4</sup> III, 11; Verr. II, 31; Caecin. 49; Planc. 56. Opposed to these eleven instances of the subjunctive there are twenty-eight indicatives, like Tim. III, 13; Tusc. V, 52; *ibid.* 67. In some of the above-cited examples, *necesse* denotes logical necessity, not the necessity of volition. In such cases, its infinitive is very nearly one of oratio obliqua.

Subjunctives with the infinitive after *licet* are found in Fin. IV, 32; Tusc. V, 85; after *nolo*, Verr. V, 173; De Orat. III, 164; Tull. 42; after *cupio*, Arch. 23; Tusc. III, 19; after *pator*, leg. agr. I, 22; after *aequom est*, Verr. III, 27; leg. agr. II, 37; after *facile est*, Caecin. 55; after *difficile est*, Font. 3; Nat. III, 1; De Orat. II, 221; after *est hominis*, De Orat. II, 87; Brut. 292; after *salsum est*, De Orat. II, 287.

In Caesar<sup>5</sup> I find no verb whose mood is shifted by the mere presence of the infinitive, though there are nearly a score of verbs attracted by subjunctives.

<sup>1</sup> This is not the *oportet* of propriety, but of logical necessity (= it must be true that). Perhaps the infinitive is best taken as one of oratio obliqua.

<sup>2</sup> We have called attention to the fact that *uelis* is suspicious.

<sup>3</sup> This is also an *oportet* of logical necessity, as that of Nat. II, 41. There is also a noticeable causal force in the relative clause. Div. II 27 may be added to this list as a possible example, but I prefer to classify it with the descriptive clauses.

<sup>4</sup> The subordinate relative clauses of some of these may be descriptive. See the preceding footnotes.

<sup>5</sup> The subjunctive of B. G. I, 3, 1, *constituerunt ea quae ad proficiscendum pertinerent comparare* should be treated with that of 3, 11, 5, *cum primum posset proficisci iubet*, as a verb in oratio obliqua. Cf. 3, 9, 3, *ea quae ad usum navium pertinent providere instituunt*.

The *second* group consists of *complementary infinitives* after *coepti*, *possum*, etc. These are not equivalent to subjunctives and there is little reason why they should exert any influence over their dependent verbs, except by analogy of the verbs of the preceding group. That a real habit was ever established in connection with verbs of this group, I doubt. The examples that seem to belong here may, I think, be explained in other ways, or as individual instances arising separately. They do not necessitate the assumption of a fixed habit.

The possible instances from early Latin are: Amph. 39, *debetis uelle* quae *uelimus*; Trin. 357, non pernegare *possum* quicquam quod *uelis*; Phorm. 78, *coepti* . . . obsequi quae *uellent*. It is rather significant that the verb in question is in every case some form of *uelle*. We have noted how prone that verb is to the softened form of statement ("subjunctive of modesty").

To offset these three doubtful cases with the subjunctive there are over thirty occurrences of the indicative, as follows: *possum*: Men. 139, Merc. 778, M. G. 312, Most. 574, Pers. 41, 66, Pseud. 670, Stich. 124, Eun. 58, Enn. (R.I) 324, Inc. Fab. (R.II) 79. *queo*: Cist. 129, Curc. 487, Merc. 338, M. G. 265, Pers. 287. *coepti*: Cas. 652. *propero*: Bacch. 1049, Curc. 536. *cesso*: Aul. 343, Men. 879, 921, Pers. 197. *occupo*: Rud. 248. *occeplast*: Eun. 22. *audeo*: Amph. 567, M. G. 232, Poen. 1311. *dubito*: Poen. 790. *neglego*: Amph. 586. *oblitus sum*: Amph. 723. *soleo* Caecilius (R.II) 196.

In Cicero I have not found a single subjunctive whose mood I can confidently attribute to the presence of an infinitive of this kind. With *debeo* the following may perhaps be cited as an example: Sulla, 36, qui barbaros homines ad bellum impelleret, non debebat . . . purgare eos de quibus illi aliquid suspicari *uiderentur*. It would not be surprising if *debeo* should make use of the same habits as are found with *oportet*, for instance. I believe, however, that de quibus . . . *uiderentur* should be interpreted as a causal clause<sup>1</sup> just as we must interpret *impelleret* of the first clause, which obviously does not depend upon the infinitive. I find the same force in Div. 2, 132. To balance these two possible cases there are forty-one instances with the indicative in the part of Cicero that is covered by Merquet's lexicon. After *coepti* + infinitive I have one example of the subjunc-

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Phil. 5, 44, *eam* complexus est causam *quae esset* senatui . . . *gratis-sima*; and Hale, Cum-Constructions, p. 176 (German translation, Leipzig, p. 212) for a long list of examples of the same nature.

tive (Verr. 4, 100, which, however, has a strong adversative bearing), matched against eight examples of the indicative. After *possum* + infinitive there is no subjunctive that is not more naturally interpreted otherwise, but over fifty instances of the indicative. *Solet* + infinitive yields one example that seems to be to the point, namely: Tusc. I, 96, Graeci in conuiujs solent nominare cui poculum *tradituri sint*. Since *mos est* + infinitive possesses the power of attraction (cf. Or. 151), *soleo* may assume the power at times. Perhaps there is here an implication of indirect discourse. At any rate, this one instance, if instance it is, is offset by twenty examples of the indicative. The relative clause of Leg. 1, 33, recte Socrates exsecrari eum solebat qui primus utilitatem a iure *seiuinxisset* is in indirect discourse. *Queo, nequeo, incipio, propero*,<sup>1</sup> *cesso, dubito*<sup>2</sup> (=hesitate), *audeo* + infinitive yield no undoubted cases of attraction in the philosophical works and speeches of Cicero.

From the preceding it appears that many infinitives, namely the historical, the exclamatory, and a large proportion of the complementary infinitives never exerted any influence upon the mood of verbs subordinated to them, that the rest did so at times, but comparatively not very often. One naturally asks why the infinitive should ever exert this influence. The infinitive *per se* can hardly be said to be more closely related to the subjunctive than to the indicative. It may obviously give expression to any of a great number of ideas which are ordinarily expressed by the indicative, as well as to ideas expressed by the subjunctive. Why then did the infinitive at times seem to claim companionship with the subjunctive? Where did it acquire the habit, in so far as it was a habit, of shifting a verb from its natural mood into another. The construction in question is not found in other languages. It is evidently a bit of mechanism which had its origin in Latin. What was the origin of the construction? In the preceding pages we have seen that the construction is

<sup>1</sup> Sall. Cat. 7 furnishes a subjunctive with the infinitive after *propero*, but the construction is unusual in that *propero* here takes an infinitive with accusative subject. Cf. Kritzius ad loc. cit. The sentence reads: *Se quisque hostem ferire, murum ascendere, conspici dum tale facinus faceret* properabat.

<sup>2</sup> Roby cites Fin. I, 62, non *dubitat, si* ita melius *sit*, migrare de uita. *Sit* is clearly a conditional subjunctive of the "less vivid future" type. There are on the contrary at least a dozen examples of the indicative after the infinitive with *dubito* in Cicero. When *dubito* is equivalent to a negative *credo*, it is, of course, followed by oratio obliqua.

found in connection with (1) *infinitives with accusative subjects* and with (2) *infinitives that can practically be displaced by subjunctives*. These facts would naturally suggest<sup>1</sup> that it had its beginnings with the constructions of *oratio obliqua* and of *attraction* proper, for in these two constructions the subordinate verb is frequently made subjunctive. Let us see by what process it arose from these.

a) It must be remembered that the use of the subjunctive in *oratio obliqua* was itself due to formal causes. The Romans could hardly have associated its use with logical considerations or with a recognition of a special *ψυχική διάθεσις*. Statements of fact as well as expressions of will, wish, etc., were involved. From this circumstance alone the presence of the one fixed element, the infinitive, would assume significance. The subjunctive mood, therefore, became in a formal way associated with the infinitive, and even beyond the confines of the construction of *oratio obliqua*, in which the first associations were formed, the subjunctive continued its relationships with the infinitive whenever the latter appeared in a garb similar to that of *oratio obliqua*, that is, whenever it appeared with an accusative subject. At times the relationship was carried even farther than that, as we have seen. But this is not all. There are some infinitives after verbs of command, prohibition, resolve, and feeling which, though not belonging to *oratio obliqua* in that they are not used for the statement of facts, nevertheless often attach to themselves dependent clauses which are virtually felt to be quotations. These furnish a direct bridge for the subjunctive from *oratio obliqua* to verbs that depend upon infinitives of will, wish, and the like. In *oratio obliqua* one will find sentences like :

QUICQUID SIT *extra Italiam id xuiros* DICIT *uendere*, "he says that the decemvirs are selling the land that lies outside of Italy".

A command after *iubet* appears thus :

QUICQUID SIT *extra Italiam id xuiros* IUBET *uendere*, Cic., Leg. Agr. II, 38 (He orders the decemvirs to sell the land that lies outside of Italy). The order was : "Sell the land that lies outside of Italy." The mood of *sit* is due to *oratio obliqua*. The step is not a long one to sentences like the following :

<sup>1</sup> This connection has been noticed before; I find that the grouping of examples in the Hale-Buck Grammar (p. 290) clearly implies it.

QUICQUID SIT *extra Italiam id xuiros* OPORTET *uendere*, (cf. Cas. 570, qui aduocatos *aduocet* rogitare oportet). Here QUICQUID SIT is not a part of a quotation, such as one finds in implied indirect discourse, but it is very near being so. It is an integral part of a conception at one time existing in the mind of some one person. It is not surprising that such sentences should come to be treated like those in oratio obliqua.

This recognition of the fact that the habit of using the subjunctive after the infinitive was partly due to the construction of oratio obliqua, will of course in no way conflict with the statement made above that, after verbs of command and prohibition, Cicero seems to draw a clear line of demarcation between the two constructions. That distinction became necessary if clearness was to be preserved. One can readily see how the one construction developed by the help of the other from a formal resemblance, and how later, when it became necessary, a careful writer would make distinctions for considerations of style.

There is nothing startling, of course, in the statement that this construction has such intimate associations with that of oratio obliqua. A connection has probably always been recognized. Perhaps the main source of danger in the usual definitions of it lay in the fact that the customary treatment has connected it *too closely* with that of oratio obliqua, which after all was not its sole sponsor.

b) In a previous study<sup>1</sup> I have called attention to the fact that verbs which depend upon subjunctives are also at times in the same mood, not because of mechanical attraction, but because they inherently contain the same modal force as that of the governing verb. Thus I explained the mood of the dependent clause in Aul. 491, *quo lubeant* nubant (They may choose their own place and marry there). *Quo lubeant* has in itself just as much as *nubant*, the *permissive* force which makes it subjunctive. If it depended upon an infinitive of permission and still expressed the same modal force, why should it not still be called a subjunctive of permission instead of being explained as influenced by the infinitive? Let the sentence be written *licet quo lubeant nubere* (cf. Cas. 873, *licet quae uelis* proloqui): it still means what it did above; *lubeant* is still a subjunctive of permission. The

<sup>1</sup> Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, p. 4. As stated there, my point of view was given by a paragraph in Hale, Sequence of Tenses, A. J. P. VIII, p. 54.

presence of the infinitive does not necessarily explain the mood. It is nearer the truth to say that the occurrences of original volitive, optative, permissive, etc., subjunctives after infinitives connected with verbs of the same general meaning, like *uolo*, *cupio*, *licet*, etc., went far towards bringing such infinitives into the habit of associating with the subjunctive. So much for the subjunctives that have their own modal force.

It obviously cannot be said that all the subjunctives which depend upon other subjunctives are of this kind. Many are mechanically attracted to that mood. My next point is that this habit of *mechanical attraction* by the subjunctive likewise exerted a marked influence upon the construction now under discussion. This was accomplished mainly by means of verbs that took now the subjunctive, now the infinitive. When they took the subjunctive, that subjunctive would often be followed by another subjunctive for purely mechanical reasons. When they took the infinitive, that infinitive adopted the same custom of governing a subjunctive. Sentences like :

Cic. Par. 20, QUAE EX EO PECCATA NASCANTUR *aequalia sint* oportet, would have a tendency to create sentences like :

Cic. Fin. I, 47, *stare* oportet in eo QUOD SIT IUDICATUM.

In the preceding we have enumerated the most important verbs that take either the infinitive or subjunctive and thus affect the problem at hand.

c) These were no doubt the predominant influences in the creation of the construction. But they were not the only ones. The anticipatory subjunctive must also be reckoned with. At this late day one need hardly attempt a defence for the recognition of that category. In another place<sup>1</sup> where I have given the literature relating to it, I have discussed its role in creating the habit of assimilation. It seems to serve practically the same purpose in this construction. In sentences like Bacch. 58, *apud me te esse miles quom ueniat uolo*, it has been customary to attribute the mood of the dependent clause to the presence of the infinitive. *Veniat*, however, refers to the future and its mood should perhaps be attributed directly to that fact,<sup>2</sup> since verbs of will and wish usually refer to the future, their infinitives frequently govern clauses that refer to the future.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Lange, loc. cit., p. 40.



The frequent occurrence of the anticipatory subjunctive after infinitives governed by these verbs would naturally add strength to the forces that were creating the construction here discussed. Perhaps the converse process was also operating. I mean that the incipient construction of "attraction by the infinitive" may have become a conserving force in retaining the use of the anticipatory subjunctive in relative clauses after the infinitive, when the future indicative was driving it out of ordinary use. It is at least true that the relationship between the anticipatory subjunctive and the subjunctive after infinitives is particularly intimate. The following sentences from Plautus are of the same nature as the one cited above:

Bacch. 76, miles *quom huc adueniat*, te uolo me amplexari.

Stich. 69, pati nos oportet *quod ille faciat*.

Stich. 686, *quisquis praetereat* commissatum uolo uocari.

Truc. 225, oportet . . . *quisquis ueniat* blande adloqui.

Not only must we reckon with subjunctives that express simple futurity, but also with those that serve to express futurity to the past.<sup>1</sup> By the very nature of the case, the ideas that usually associate with the infinitives of will and wish very frequently call into service the future tenses. When expressions of this kind are made dependent upon verbs in a past tense, there is at once a demand for tenses that can express futurity to the past. These tenses are found in the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive. Thus the original command represented in Andr. 464, *quod peperisset iussit tolli* was probably *quod pepererit tolle!* When that future-perfect-indicative verb is thrown into dependence upon a verb in the past, there is no other tense to express just the idea desired. The mood of *peperisset* is therefore not due to its dependence upon the infinitive *tollī*. As a past-future, or, more precisely, a past-future-perfect, it is necessarily subjunctive. In this fact there probably lies another bond of association between the infinitive and the subjunctive.

The above mentioned considerations will directly account for many of the subjunctives that depend upon infinitives, for so

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hale-Buck Grammar, 508: "In general *all* past-future ideas must, if expressed by a finite verb, be in the anticipatory subjunctive; for *no other means* of expression exists." The exception implied by the words "in general" are clauses in the periphrastic future in which futurity is expressed not by the finite verb but by the participle. See also Walker, The Sequence of Tenses in Latin, p. 26.

many in fact that it can readily be seen how the subjunctive acquires the fondness for sojourning with the infinitive, even when there is no special reason for its doing so.

This study of origins will in turn throw light upon the reasons for some of the limitations of the construction. It is now easy to see why the historical infinitive does not take a subjunctive. This infinitive is wholly unlike the infinitive of *oratio obliqua* in that it has a nominative subject; it is seldom equivalent to a subjunctive; it is seldom connected with futurity. In fact, the only point of contact between the historical infinitive and those which employ this construction is furnished by the bare fact that both have the infinitive form. This point of contact was evidently too slender to form a bridge for the extension of the construction. Practically the same condition of things holds true as regards the complementary infinitives of our second group. As for the infinitive of exclamation, I see no reason *a priori* why it should not have adopted the habit. I can only say that the data are very meager, and that, by the nature of the case, its dependent clauses are usually causal and descriptive. Perhaps if there had been more instances of its occurrence, we should have found some case of "attraction" here also.

The following few observations about the general behavior of the construction may be of practical use for pedagogical purposes. The construction was never so well developed that its observance became obligatory, but it is possible to a certain extent to state to what limitations its use is subject.

In the first place, the dependent verbs to be "attracted" must be conceived of by the mind as an *integral part* of the volition, wish, statement of obligation, etc., that is conveyed by the infinitive. This fact is so obvious, and is so often dwelt upon in the grammars that it need not here be illustrated. Secondly, *no special emphasis* must be laid upon the dependent verbs; that is, the dependent verb will usually remain in the indicative if the burden of pointing a contrast or comparison in ideas is laid upon it, or if it is called upon to express a time differing from that of the infinitive upon which it depends. Again, and partly for the reason just given, the verb must belong to a *generalizing* rather than to a more precise determinative clause. There is also another and a very important reason for this fact: the generalizing clause is *necessarily* an integral part of the main conception, whereas the determinative clause is so only at times.

For example, if the relative clause of a sentence like *uolo eum mittere eos qui parati sint* is generalizing, the desire necessarily includes it. The desire is: *mittat eos qui parati sint*. If, however, the relative clause is determinative, the wish-concept as it assumes definite shape in thought or spoken phrase, may often not include it. The definite concept may simply be *mittat eos* accompanied with a less definitely conceived idea which expresses itself, let us say, by a gesture, towards certain persons who *are ready* (*parati sint*). The *position of the verb* with reference to the infinitive is also of importance, as well as the *point of attachment* to the infinitive. For instance, a majority of the attracted verbs belong to relative clauses attached to the *object* of the infinitive. Comparatively few are attached to the subject. A few are adverbial and depend upon the infinitive itself. Herein this construction differs from that of attraction proper, in the examples of which the adverbial clause takes a very prominent place. The reason for the difference lies in the fact that adverbial clauses are seldom attached in sense to the infinitive alone, but usually depend upon the verbal idea made by the combination of the governing verb and the infinitive.

Further, several conjunctions that play an important part in attraction proper, are never or rarely found in the construction with the infinitive. In fact, only the relative and temporal conjunctions that imply the closest possible union of the two elements may be expected to appear. For instance, one must note differences of this nature: while *ubi* or *cum* often introduce a dependent verb whose time is synchronous with that of the infinitive, *postquam* always implies priority of time on the part of the verb it introduces, and attraction should not be expected under such circumstances. *Quamquam* points a contrast, *ut* and *quam* introduce comparisons, and consequently involve greater precision in the expression of tense and of mood in the dependent verbs. Neither are the causal clauses with *quod*, *quia*, *quando* and *quoniam* so intimately bound up with the main verbs as to be felt as integral parts. Whenever the subjunctive is found after these, the mood is due to implied indirect discourse.

With the exceptions herein made, it may be said that in general the limitations of this construction are of the same nature as those of attraction proper, which I have presented in the paper on that subject, already referred to. This construction with the

infinitive, however, is far more sensitive to its limitations, and demands more favorable circumstances for its occurrence. It is accordingly much rarer than the other construction.

To summarize, in conclusion, the results of this study: it has shown, I think, that the power of shifting a dependent verb from the indicative to the subjunctive mood is, as a rule, possessed only by those infinitives that are practically equivalent to subjunctives and by those that are in construction similar to those of oratio obliqua, that the so-called historical infinitive, the exclamatory infinitive, and a great body of the complementary infinitives that are not included in the classes given above do not possess this power; also that the subjunctives with infinitives after *iubeo*, *decerno*, and the like, and after verbs of feeling like *gaudeo*, *moleste fero*, *miror*, should be classed with those of oratio obliqua. It has traced the birth of the construction with the infinitive to those of oratio obliqua, attraction, future and past-future subjunctives. It has also shown that the construction is much rarer than our definitions usually imply, and it has pointed out the obstacles that limited the extension of the construction.

BRYN MAWR.

TENNEY FRANK.